UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,390	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030238US1	7557

7590	12/02/2005

William J. McGinnis, Jr.
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
HARPER, LEON JONATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/600,390	CHATTERJEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon J. Harper	2166	

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 June 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 June 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the application 10600390 filed on 6/20/2003.

Claims 1-35 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

    1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
    2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
    3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
    4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
            obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-20, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US 5253362 (hereinafter Nolan) in view of US 6571295 (hereinafter Sidana).

As for claim 1 Nolan discloses: one or more applications for manipulating data

(See figure one #18 application modules); an annotation store for storing annotations

created for data manipulated by the one or more applications (See column 5 lines 35-

40), and an annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and provide

one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing annotations for data

manipulated by the one or more applications (See column 6 lines 40-46).

While Nolan does disclose an annotation browser configured to access the

annotation store and provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and

viewing annotations for data manipulated by the one or more applications (see above),

aspects of the disclosure are not explicit. Sidana however, does explicitly disclose an

annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and provide one or more

graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing annotations for data manipulated by

the one or more applications (See figures 9 and 11 and column 7 lines 13-17). It would

have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated

the teachings of Sidana into the system of Nolan. The modification would have been

obvious because user do not typically have access to software code, and a browser to

facilitate the use of annotations helps to encapsulate the coding details from the user

(See Sidana column 1 lines 55-57).

As for claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Nolan

discloses: the annotation browser is separate to the one or more applications (See

figure 1 note the forms manager is separate from the applications module).

As for claim 3, the rejection of 1 is incorporated, and further Sidana discloses:

wherein the annotation browser is a web-based browser (See column 4 lines 5-9).

As for claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Sidana

discloses: further comprising an annotation server (See column 4 lines 58-63).

As for claim 5, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated, and further Sidana

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to access: the annotation store

independently of the annotation server (See column 6 lines 6-10).

As for claim 6, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated, and further Nolan

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to access the annotation store

via the annotation server (See figure 1 and note forms goes through local data storage).

As for claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further, Sidana discloses: further comprising a set of one or more application programming interface functions, wherein the annotation browser is configured to communicate with the annotation server via calls to one or more of the application programming interface functions (See column 8 lines 55-58, note figure 8 "add annotation" also note embodiment "delete" :edit).

As for claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Sidana discloses: wherein the system further comprises one or more graphical user interfaces, accessible from within one or more of the applications, for creating and viewing annotations (See column 4 lines 4-9 note no changes made to the actual web page).

As for claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Sidana discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects (See figure 4).

As for claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Sidana discloses: wherein selecting the links to associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated annotated data objects to be invoked (See column 6 lines 10-15).

As for claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further wherein the

annotation browser is configured to display data and indications of what displayed data

has one or more corresponding annotations (See column 6 lines 25-31).

As for claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Nolan

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display one or more

annotation icons proximate to an annotated data object (See column 5 lines 14-19 and

lines 38-41 note indicator).

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further Nolan

discloses: wherein: at least one common annotation describes more than one data

object (See figure 6 and column 5 lines 51-55), and the annotation browser is

configured to display a common annotation icon proximate to data objects described by

the common annotation (See column 5 lines 60-65 notes the nurses notes hold

annotations).

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Nolan

discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display different annotation

icons proximate to data objects described by different annotations (See figure 5 and

note that you are going to get a different view depending on what the annotation is).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 5 line60-column 6 line 4 and noting that icon is in a cell and will display differently depending on the annotation) .

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an associated annotation icon (See Figure 5 "showing details").

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further Nolan disclose: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See figure 6 "expanded annotations").

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, retrieve the second portion of annotation data from the annotation store (See figure 6 and note that annotations are contained within the local data storage).

As for claim 19 Nolan discloses: one or more applications for manipulating data

(See figure one #18 application modules); at least one application data store for storing

data manipulated by the one or more applications (See figure1) at least one annotation

store for storing annotations created for data manipulated by the applications (See

column 5 lines 35-40),, and an executable component configured to access both the

one or more application data stores and the one or more annotation stores (See column

4 lines 21-23 and figure 1 electronic data storage interface).

As for claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further Sidana

discloses: wherein the executable component is a web-based browser (See column 4

lines 5-9).

As for claim 25 Nolan discloses: an annotation database for storing annotations

separately from the data sources associated with the annotations (See figure 1 note the

local data storage and #21), a set of annotatable data object points defining portions of

the data sources associated with the annotations described by the associated

annotations (See figure 2), a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of

annotation fields (See column 5 lines 50-55);

Sidana discloses: a set of plug-in components, each for interfacing between one

or more applications and an annotation server (See column 4 lines 40-44 note

redirector is memory and can be a plug in); and an annotation server configured to

receive, via the plug-in components, requests to access annotations for one or more of

the annotatable data object points issued by the one or more of the applications running

on the client computer and generate a graphical user interface screen, based on an

annotation structure associated with the one or more of the annotatable data object

points (See figure 2), for creating or viewing annotations for the one or more

annotatable data object points', and a browser application configured to browse

annotations in the annotation store (See figure 9 and column 9 lines 50-54).

As for claim 26, the rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Sidana

discloses: wherein the browser application is configured to provide links to annotated

data objects (See figure 4).

As for claim 27 Sidana discloses: installing the annotation management system

on the network (See column 4 lines 45-48 note the world wide web is a network);

identifying annotatable data objects manipulated by at least one application on the

network capable of being annotated by the annotation management system (See

column 4 lines 37-40); and providing an annotation browser separate from the at least

one application for browsing annotations created for the annotatable data objects (note

the differences between figures 4 and 9).

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nolan as applied to claim 19 above, in view of Sidana and in further view of US

5309359 (hereinafter Katz).

As for claim 21, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further Katz

discloses: wherein the executable component provides one or more graphical user

interface screens allowing a user to query the annotation store for annotations satisfying

one or more specified annotation query criteria (See column 8 lines 11-14). It would

have been obvious to have incorporated the teaching of Katz into the system of Nolan

and Sidana. The modification would have been obvious because annotations are types

of information that describes data, and user should be able to perform searches on data

based on their descriptions of the data or preferred nomenclatures.

As for claim 22, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, and further allowing a

user to query the application data store for annotations satisfying one or more specified

application data query criteria (See column 8 lines 21-24).

Sidana discloses: wherein the executable component provides one or more

graphical user interface screens (See column 5 lines 65-67).

As for claim 23, the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and further, Sidana

discloses: wherein the executable component further provides: one or more graphical

user interface screens for displaying, and one or more graphical user interface screens

for creating annotations (See column 5 lines 65-67).

Katz however discloses: results data satisfying the one or more specified

application data query criteria (See column 8 lines 48-52) for results data satisfying the

one or more specified application data query criteria (See figure 4b and column 10 lines

32-36).

As for claim 24, the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and further Katz

discloses: wherein the executable component is configured to: query the application

data store for data satisfying the one or more specified application data query criteria

(See figure 3), and query the annotation data store for annotations satisfying the one or

more specified annotation query criteria that are associated with the data satisfying the

one or more specified application data query criteria (See Column 8 lines 52-57).

Claims 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nolan and Sidana as applied to claim 25 above, in further view of US Katz.

As for claim 28, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated, and further Katz discloses: configured to query both annotations and annotated data (See column 8 lines 34-37). Sidana discloses a browser (See column 5 lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the teaching of Katz into the system of Nolan and Sidana. The modification would have been obvious because browsers allow of users to view web-viewable documents and since users cannot modify HTTP protocol, providing a method of storing, searching and viewing annotations is essential (See Sidana column 1 lines 55-58).

As for claim 29, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated, and further Katz discloses: allows for the simultaneous searching of annotations and annotated data objects (See column 7 31-36 note structured = object, unstructured = regular annotation). Sidana discloses an annotation browser (See column 5 lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the teaching of Katz into the system of Nolan and Sidana. The modification would have been obvious because searching both annotations and annotated data objects increases the chance of finding the correct annotation.

As for claim 30, the rejection of claim 29, is incorporated, and further Katz discloses is configured to receive, from a requesting entity, a request to simultaneous search both annotations and annotated data, based on at least one annotation search

condition and at least one data search condition provided in the request (See column 8

lines 11-15 note that you can search in natural form and it is converted to structured

form). Sidana discloses an annotation browser (See figure 4).

As for claim 31, the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated, and further Katz

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to return, to the

requesting entity a list of data objects satisfying the at least one data search condition

and having annotations satisfying the at least one annotation search condition (See

column 60-66 "pointers").

As for claim 32, the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated, and further Katz

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to return, to the

requesting entity, a list of annotations satisfying the at least one annotation search

condition and describing data satisfying the at least one data search condition (See

column 60-66 text the pointers point to).

Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sidana in view of Katz.

As for claim 33, Sidana discloses: providing one or more graphical user interface

screens (See figure 4).

Sidana however does not explicitly disclose for specifying one or more

annotation search conditions', for specifying one or more data search conditions', and

simultaneously searching both annotations and annotated data, based on at the least

one annotation search condition and at the least one data search condition. Katz

however does discloses specifying one or more annotation search conditions', for

specifying one or more data search conditions', and simultaneously searching both

annotations and annotated data, based on at the least one annotation search condition

and at the least one data search condition (See column 7 31-36 note structured =

object, unstructured = regular annotation). It would have been obvious to an artisan of

ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Katz into the

system of Sidana. The modification would have been obvious because searching both

annotations and annotated data objects increases the chance of finding the correct

annotation.

As for claim 34, the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated, and further Katz

discloses: wherein the operations further comprise displaying a list of data objects

satisfying the at least one data search condition and having annotations satisfying the at

least one annotation search condition (See column 60-66 "pointers").

As for claim 35, the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated, and further, Katz

discloses: wherein the operations further comprise displaying a list of annotations

satisfying the at least one annotation search condition and describing data satisfying the

at least one data search condition (See column 60-66 "annotation pointed to").

Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-

0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LJH
Leon Harper
November 22, 2005

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER